

Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93943-5138

NPS(91/Dj)  
22 Jan 99

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

Subj: MINUTES OF THE RESEARCH BOARD MEETING

1. The Research Board Meeting commenced at 1510, 20 Jan 99, Sp-101A. Following is a list of attendees:

Dean Netzer	Code 09	<u>Not in attendance:</u>
Danielle Kuska	Code 91	
Judy Joyce	Code 09	Prof Rasmussen - Faculty Council Rep
Prof Biblarz	AA	
Prof Borges	MA	
Prof Rowe	CS	
Prof Tummala	EC	
Prof Brown	OR	
Prof Wirtz	NS	
Prof Shin	ME	
Prof Chang (rep. Prof Davidson)	MR	
Prof Thornton	OC	
Prof Eagle	GP	
Prof Eitelberg	SM	
Prof Weitzman	Faculty Council Rep	

2. A memo from Prof Halwach (05) was distributed which summarized the legacy and upgraded NPS networks. During a previous Planning Board meeting, RADM Chaplin asked whether or not researchers at NPS would be interested in using and supporting a network with increased bandwidth. \$55K a year would double the bandwidth and \$100K would triple it. Dean Netzer will ask Prof Halwach to provide a short "benefits" paper to distribute to all Research Board members. --→ **Tom indicates that all traffic to the internet goes through a 45Mbit straw. At peak times during the day there is a bandwidth limit, particularly noticed since everyone on the ATM network has a 100Mbit tunnel to the firewall.** *Each board member will discuss with his/her department/group to determine the need/requirement for increased bandwidth and the interest to mutually support it. Responses should be e-mailed to Dean Netzer.*
3. There was a brief discussion as to how NPS (Comptroller) applies the labor acceleration (0.43) for intermittent non-tenure-track faculty. There was a question as to how many intermittent employees there are in each department and whether or not it is a significant issue? *Each board member will discuss with his/her department/group and determine if this is a significant issue, and e-mail a response back to Dean Netzer.*
4. D. Netzer presented a cost-comparison for doing research at NPS and at another research

university and asked for discussion and alternative methods for doing the comparison. Some thought that only teaching requirement differences and the associated research labor to buy-out should be considered. **After the meeting C.P. Chang sent D. Netzer some additional comments together with the NSF policy on funding faculty labor.** Additional comparisons will be presented at the next Research Board meeting for further discussion.

5. Dean Netzer briefly addressed the current classification for papers, presentations, etc., contained in the NPS Research Summary, which double-counts papers that are both presented and appear in print. It was agreed that double-counting is to be eliminated. *A proposed revision for comments will be distributed.* **Proposal for discussion at next meeting: Use 5 classifications; Journal Papers, Conference Papers (published in printed or electronic form), Conference Presentations (not published in printed or electronic form), Technical Reports, Other.**
6. The time-limits for non-tenure-track research employees as stated in the current Faculty Handbook (not in the Pink Book) were discussed. It is an issue for employees like those at CIRPAS and other research facilities where those employed wish it to be a career path. The issue of differences between the faculty and GS pay scales is a part of this situation and was also discussed. **Recommendation for discussion at next meeting: Add the position Research Engineer/Scientist. Typically without a PhD but with a degree in engineering or science. This is a nontenure-track position and is used for those who provide long-term engineering/science support to specific reimbursable projects. There shall be no limit to the number of one-year reappointments that are permitted.**
7. The advisability of having non-tenure-track faculty as NRC postdoctoral advisors was discussed. The general consensus was that non-tenure-track faculty should not be NRC postdoctoral advisors, but they should be teamed with approved tenure-track advisors (faculty).
8. The final draft of the NPS Instruction for Establishment and Operation of Research Centers, and all current renewal applications, were distributed for review. Board members were asked to submit their responses/comments to the Research Office (results will be discussed at next board meeting). *Dolores will e-mail the response/ comment form to each board member right away.*
9. Dean Netzer announced again that Vinnie Schaefer and Doug Harry of ONR will be visiting NPS for the SBIR meeting on 21 Jan. and encouraged maximum representation from each department/group. **(Note: There was good attendance and discussion. Thanks).**
10. Dean Netzer announced that the new DDR&E turned down NPS' request to be allowed to compete for DURIP funds (major scientific equipment) but he will continue to explore alternatives. **Subsequent discussions with ONR will be reviewed at the next meeting.**
11. Following is an initial agenda for the February Research Board meeting:
  - Dept/group responses regarding the need/requirement for increased bandwidth on the NPS network and whether researchers are willing to fund.
  - Responses regarding the significance of labor acceleration for intermittent adjunct faculty.
  - Revised classification of submissions to NPS Research Summary.
  - Addition of a non-tenure-track position with no renewal limits (i.e., Research Engineer,

Research Scientist)

- Further discussion on cost-comparison for doing research at NPS and other institutions
- Voting result (response/comment(s)) from board members on Research Center renewal applications
- Comments from ONR on NPS/DURIP situation.

12. Meeting adjourned at 1655.

Respectfully submitted,

Dolores Jackson  
Recording Secretary

Copy to:  
01/06/07/08/JW  
Assoc. Chairs for Research  
Faculty Chair